



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

know not. On p. 67, the reference in the sixth line should be to p. 65, and in the Index (which is too brief) under Longinus the citation of p. 64 is defective. Cicero's remark about Dicaearchus (p. 20) was, of course, a bit of sarcasm, as no doubt Dr. Gudeman knows, though perhaps all his readers may not. In connection with what Pisistratus did or did not do on Homer (p. 10), the important Townley scholion to *Iliad* K should be cited. A recent article in the *Bolletino di Filologia Classica* (XIV. 26) suggests that perhaps the new manuscript of *Agricola* and *Germania* is not altogether without significance (p. 149). No biography of Poggio (p. 157) is cited, but perhaps Dr. Gudeman agrees with me in thinking Shepherd's almost too small for mention. I recall it here only in the hope of stimulating some young scholar in search of a subject to undertake a work which should be enthralling. But it needs a light hand and not too many bristling footnotes.

These, however, are all slight matters. The real blemish in this book is a certain provincialism which is still too common in the products of Germany. There was once a reason for this in a philological leadership which no longer exists unchallenged. We no longer look merely to Germany for fresh ideas; we find them in France, in England, particularly in Italy in recent years, and even American products cannot be neglected. But writers of all these nationalities are too much neglected in the bibliographical lists of this book. And when we come to the lists of scholars in the different periods since the Renaissance, why should the French list stop with Montfaucon and the Italian with Victorius? Where, for instance, are Graux, Mionnet, Cohen, Mai, Borghesi, De Rossi, Fiorelli? And take England: if we must hear of German school teachers like Agricola and Reuchlin (*quos sine contumelia laudo*), why not also of other pioneers such as Sir Thomas Smith and Sir John Cheke, or of greater men like Linacre, Gataker, Gale, Gibbon, and Clinton. Dr. Gudeman mentions nobody in comparative grammar before G. Curtius; what of Bopp, Sir W. Jones, and Halhed? To come to our own country were perhaps invidious; but is a history of classical philology complete that says nothing, for instance, of E. A. Sophocles, Beck, Salisbury, and Whitney? These and like omissions under other nationalities are defects which should be remedied in future editions if the work is to commend itself fully in other lands than Germany.

MORRIS H. MORGAN

---

*Lexicon Plautinum.* Conscripsit GONZALEZ LODGE. Leipzig: Teubner, Vol. I, fasc. 1-5 (A-EGO), 1901-8. Pp. 480. Each fasc., M. 7.20.

American scholars are sometimes reproached with the fact that they rarely take up a large piece of work. Professor Lodge's *Lexicon* refutes

this charge for his case at least. Anyone who glances over the thousands of citations which these five fascicles contain will recognize this fact at once. Indeed the editor spent ten years, we understand, in collecting his material before he began the composition of a single article.

The material given in most articles is arranged under two heads, viz. *Forma* and *Significatio*. Sometimes, as in the case of *cum*, *de*, or *edepol*, a third category, *Collocatio*, appears. Where a word has both an unassimilated and an assimilated form, the editor seems to have chosen the assimilated forms, e. g., *affatim*, *affero*, and *alloquor*, for the lemma. This seems hardly consistent with the appearance in other lemmas of such archaic forms as *avorto* and *avos*. Under *Forma* are given not only all the orthographical variants and the inflectional forms which the word in question has in Plautus, but also the MS readings and the readings adopted by Loewe, Goetz, and Schoell, by the Teubner text, by Leo, and by Ussing, to which from the fourth fascicle on Lindsay's readings have been added. Under *Collocatio*, noteworthy facts with reference to the position which a word takes in different idioms are set down. *Significatio* for many words falls into two main headings, the proper, and the transferred meaning. Sometimes, as in the case of a verb (e. g., *curo*), syntax furnishes the basis of further subdivision. In these subdivisions when a paragraph is given up to the occurrence of the lemma with a single word, e. g., *cum* with *esse*, the citations stand in the alphabetized order of the plays. Where a paragraph deals with several words, the alphabetical order of the words concerned is followed, e. g., *agere*, *degere*, *exigere*, etc. A bibliography is given in the first and fourth fascicles to which many additions are made in the several articles. To the fifth fascicle Professors Waters and Sihler have contributed the articles on *cum* and *de* and on *dico* respectively.

The editor's purpose was to furnish all the material for a study of Plautine meanings, and this object he has accomplished admirably. In point of fact he has done much more. He has given us a solid basis also for the study of Plautine forms, inflections, syntax, and word-groups, and has shown, as it never has been shown before, Plautus' use and his failure to use certain words and the characteristics of his style. The study of morphology, syntax, and sentence-accent in particular will be greatly furthered by this work. For the sake of completeness, the reviewer could wish that the editor had included prosody, pronunciation, word-accent, and the vernacular meaning of peculiar idioms in the scope of his plan. It would have been interesting, for instance, to have had his opinion on the prosody of *eodem*, the accent of a tribrach to which a short enclitic is appended, and the meaning of such characteristic and difficult idioms as *quid ais* and *quid tu ais* might well have been given, but this would be asking too much even of so generous a lexicographer as Professor Lodge.

Criticism of this work is likely to be directed to three main points: (1) to the inclusion of variants from several editions, (2) to the classification within the articles, and (3) to the use of a large number of subdivisions. Most lexicographers either establish a text of their own or follow some good text. So, for instance, Leo's text has been made the basis for the Plautine citations which are appearing in the *Thesaurus*. Space, as well as the reader's time in examining a citation, is saved by these means. But the text of Plautus is not so surely established as is that of many other ancient authors, and it is very helpful to learn from a lexicon that at a given point there is difficulty and to get all the light upon it which may be had from the MS readings and from the conjectures of the best Plautine critics. The bearing of the second and third points of criticism may be illustrated by a brief examination of the article on *contra*. This word is treated under two heads, viz., as an adverb, and as a preposition with the accusative, dative, and ablative. All the instances cited with the dative and ablative, e. g., *aurichalco contra non carum fuit meum mendacium*, Ps. 688, the reviewer would regard as adverbial. Lodge gives three cases with the accusative as sure and four more as possible. In all his possible instances the accusative should probably be taken as the object of the verb of the sentence; the text is doubtful in all three of his sure cases, while over against these three stand fifty-four clear instances of the use of *contra* as an adverb. In other words, it is very doubtful if *contra* should ever be taken as a preposition in Plautus. In the same article heading No. 4, "*leniore sensu*," is rather vague; Nos. 6 and 7 are not classified on the same basis as the other numbers, and it is not clear why *Per.* 208 under No. 6 does not stand under No. 1. This brief analysis of a rather extreme case may illustrate the different opinions which may be held by scholars with reference to the classification of meanings in some of the articles, but in general the classification has been made with great judgment and the results presented with admirable clearness. The completed work will contain sixteen fascicles so that approximately one-third of it is already in print. The citations for the entire lexicon are already prepared and the MS for the sixth fascicle, which completes the letter F, is ready for the printer, so that the completion of the work within a reasonable time is assured. It will stand as a worthy monument to the scholarship of the editor.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

---

*Singular und Plural*. By KURT WITTE. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. viii + 270. M. 8.

Witte begins with the proposition, well supported, that each word had originally its own number, e. g., *πηγαί, ῥοαί, θύραι, λαοί, ζειαί, κριθαί, πύλαι, ῥῖνες, φρένες, τρίχες, ἔθειραι, σάρκες, ὄχρα* were plural only; while *εὐνή, κλισίη,*